

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JS-6

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. **ED CV 17-1672-JFW (SHK)**

Date: August 23, 2017

Title: Nhuong Van Nguyen -v- Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, et al.

PRESENT:

HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Shannon Reilly
Courtroom Deputy

None Present
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:

None

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:

None

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS):

**ORDER DISMISSING ACTION FOR LACK OF
SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

On August 18, 2017, Plaintiff Nhuong Van Nguyen ("Plaintiff") filed a Complaint in this Court, alleging that this Court has diversity jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). Diversity jurisdiction founded under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) requires that (1) all plaintiffs be of different citizenship than all defendants, and (2) the amount in controversy exceed \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). Based on the allegations of the Complaint, both Plaintiff and the Defendants appear to be citizens of California.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3) specifically states that "[i]f the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Pursuant to Rule 12(h)(3), "a court may raise the question of subject matter jurisdiction, *sua sponte*, at any time during the pendency of the action, even on appeal." *Snell v. Cleveland, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 822, 826 (9th Cir. 2002); see also *Emerich v. Touche Ross & Co.*, 846 F.2d 1190, 1194 n. 2 (9th Cir. 1988) (noting that "[i]t is elementary that the subject matter jurisdiction of the district court is not a waivable matter and may be raised at anytime by one of the parties, by motion or in the responsive pleadings, or *sua sponte* by the trial or reviewing court").

Accordingly, the Court hereby **DISMISSES** this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.